

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 21 are pending. Claims 5-9 and 11-14 have been amended. Claims 22-26 have been added. Following entry of the amendments, claims 1-14 and 21-26 will be pending.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9, 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 7 to provide proper antecedent basis. Claims 11-14 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from newly added claims 22 and 23. Newly added claims 22 and 23 provide proper antecedent basis for claims 11-14. Therefore, amended claims 9 and 11-14 are not indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the above reasons.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,600,168 issued to Lee ("Lee") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,242,009 B1 issued to Ju ("Ju"). Claims 2-3 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Ju as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,070 issued to Mandelman et al. ("Mandelman"). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Ju as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,043,545 issued to Tseng et al. ("Tseng"). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Ju as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,218,276 B1 issued to Liu et al. ("Liu"). Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Ju as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,441,433 B1 issued to En et al. ("En"). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

**Ju and En and the Present Application, at Time of the Invention
of the Present Invention, were Commonly Owned**

The claimed invention and the Ju and En patents were, at the time the present invention was made, owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity, namely ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., a corporation of Delaware, having a place of business at One AMD Place, P.O. Box 3453, Sunnyvale, California 94088-3453 U.S.A.

In addition, Ju and En only qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Therefore, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 103(c) withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested, see, for example, MPEP § 706.02(l)(1).

As indicated by the Examiner, Lee alone does not teach or suggest all the features of the present invention. Mandelman, Tseng and Liu, alone or in combination do not make up for the deficiencies of Lee. Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are considered to be allowable.

NEW CLAIMS

The newly added dependent claims 22-27 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and define additional novel and unobvious features of the present invention. Therefore, claims 22-27 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above with regard to amended claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net additional claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that an extension of time is necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extension is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988; Our Order No. F0537 (AMDSP0429US). Additionally, any additional fee(s) resulting from this

Serial No. 09/873,674

Attorney Docket No. F0537

communication (including fees for net additional claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to our above-identified deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Romero". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Andrew" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Romero".

Andrew Romero, Reg. No. 43,890

1621 Euclid Avenue, 19th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-2191
Telephone: (216) 621-1113
Facsimile: (216) 621-6165

R:\ARomero\Cases\AMDS\IP0429US\Reply to OA dated 011603.doc